

medicine he is doing so in open violation of the law, and should be arrested. There can be no argument or discussion; it is not a matter of opinion, but a matter of fact. Sympathy does not enter into the question, nor should friendship; nor does personal animus. The public, whose servants we are, should be protected; every man who is violating laws intended for the public protection, should be arrested, and that promptly.

For many reasons the work of the Board in prosecuting illegal practitioners has been slow.

ENFORCE THE LAW.

Every trick of the law has been used to interfere with the work; and this by those who should be with us and not against us, as well as by the recognized quack. But on the whole, good progress has been made and the law is by no means a dead letter. The contention that the law should not be enforced simply because its constitutionality has been questioned, is absolutely absurd. The law remains until it is wiped out, and the mere fact that the Supreme Court is considering its constitutionality does not legalize the status of the illegal practitioner. Practically all of the corporations, railroads, steamship companies and health boards have recognized the value of enforcing the law, and have, at the request of the Board, dismissed illegal practitioners. Two exceptions may be noted. One is the Equitable Life Assurance Co., whose medical referee in this locality is an unlicensed physician. The matter was called to the attention of the company, but it is reported that they have decided to do nothing in the matter, taking the ground that this physician does not practice medicine and so does not come within the provisions of the law. This may be technically correct, but is it professionally and ethically right? Does it gratify your sense of right dealing to contemplate this lack of respect toward the standards which you have said shall apply to medical men in your state? Is this corporation so big, so powerful, so rich, so influential in this state that it can with safety and immunity disregard the respectful behest of your representatives—the men you have chosen to stand for you in the protection of the public and the enforcement of the law? Think about it. It is the principle involved, the support given to other persons who are not licensed, and who do practice medicine—illegally.

In a state institution presided over by the president of one of our county medical societies, is a physician who has no license to practice. Here is a man who is employed by the state and is caused, by virtue of such employment, to violate a state law! The state aiding and abetting in the open and continuous violation of its own

law! That is certainly a good (?) example to set. The Board of Examiners notified the proper state officials, but the request that the law be enforced was ignored. In some correspondence relating to the prosecution of another illegal practitioner, occurs the following quotation from a letter written by the superintendent of the institution above referred to, to the district attorney of another county:

"Further, one of the graduates of the P. & S. is one of my assistant physicians in the ———. A complaint was made to the Governor and to the State Lunacy Commissioner against him. This man wrote to the President of the Board of Medical Examiners a letter of inquiry simply asking when the next meeting of their Board would take place. * * * He went before the Board, took the examination and was turned down. The matter was referred to the Lunacy Commission at which session there was present Dr. F. W. Hatch, Superintendent of State Hospitals; W. S. Melick, Secretary of State Board of Examiners representing the Governor; U. S. Webb, Attorney General, and C. F. Curry, Secretary of State; also Dr. N. K. Foster, Secretary of State Board of Health. Their decision was that inasmuch as the constitutionality of the law had been called in question and the matter was before the Supreme Court for adjudication that the matter be left 'statu quo' until that decision was rendered."

That seems to be truly a Solonic decision! On the same line of reasoning it would seem possible to commit all the murders you cared to, should some one only question the constitutionality of the criminal law. There's aid and encouragement, with a vengeance!

Either the law should be upheld or it should be done away with. If it is good, then you should aid in carrying it out and enforcing it, and not allow obstacles to be placed in the way of those who endeavor to do their duty. The fact that a conviction has been secured in every case prosecuted before a jury by the Board, is evidence that its method of procedure is both good sense and good law. It seems almost unbelievable, but the Board reports that its work has been hindered very greatly by licensed members of the profession. Some of these, by letters and verbal requests, and through professional and political influence, have endeavored to upset the work of the Board and prevent certain arrests and prosecutions. Is this sort of thing fair or right? Are you going to tolerate it? If you are—if you are going to permit of "exceptions"—then let us try to do away with the law altogether. In at least one instance several men of prominence in the community, professors in medical colleges, a State

HELP OR HINDRANCE.